NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III. SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1834. NO. 41.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

ORIGINAL SERMON.

Reliance on God in the discharge of our duties.

BY C. F. LE FEVRE.

Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Matt. vi, 26.

A firm and unshaken reliance in the divine goodness, as it presents us with the strongest ground for comfort and assurance, so also does it afford a rational foundation for our faith.—From the recollection of past mercies and the enjoyment of present blessings we can contemplate future prospects with calmness and assurance, believing that the same gracious Being who has hitherto protected and preserved us, will never abandon or forsake the creature who has enjoyed so many tokens of his paternal affection. How impregnable then, is that citadel against the attacks of infidelity and the fury of fanaticism, whose deep foundations are laid in the *unchanging* goodness of a God of love!—As on the one hand, we are delivered from that servile bondage of fear, which lays its iron grasp on the pale and trembling child of human frailty, so on the other, are we delivered from that sad condition in which God himself is blotted out of the sum of existence and man left to wander uncared for, unguided and unprotected, —the creature of an hour—an intellectual meteor, passing with its train of light through the world, and rapidly descending to the shades of an eternal night!

How full of instruction, consolation and encouragement are the words of our text and connecting verses. They were spoken by the great Reformer of Nazareth to that little band of followers who were about to devote body and mind in the service of their master. Though engaged in the most glorious and holy cause ever undertaken by mortal man, and that too under the guidance of one in whom they could place the utmost reliance, yet they could not help feeling some anxiety about that temporal provision, so indispensable to human nature, under whatever circumstances it may be found to exist. When they became disciples of Christ, they ceased not to be men, and as such they would of necessity feel some solicitude for their future prospects, since they had abandoned those humble occupations by which they had hitherto supported themselves, and were enlisted in the service of him who as a public teacher was wholly occupied in the great work of moral reformation. Their prospects for even obtaining sufficient to satisfy the demands of nature were far from flattering. To them there was no *visible* means of support, and in their leader they had only the example of extreme poverty and absolute dependence. He had honestly confessed of himself to the Scribe, who professed himself willing to follow him whithersoever he should lead the way, 'the foxes of the earth have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' And here we must indulge in a passing remark on the frankness of this conduct on the part of the Redeemer.—There appears in this no disposition to enlist any in his cause, whatever might have been their rank and influence, without setting before them plainly the privations to which they would have to submit. There was no eagerness manifested to hurry them into the church; there were no denunciations of everlasting wo, if they did not instantly *submit*, and without delay take up the cross and follow him. It has been left for the refinements of modern christianity to pursue the *forcing* system, in obtaining disciples.

On the other hand we see the Saviour honestly dissuading any one from embarking in the arduous undertaking, unless he felt willing to forego his present ease and convenience, for a life of privation, toil and suffering. Under such discouraging circumstances, so plainly developed in the actual condition of the *leader*, it is not to be wondered at that his *followers* should have experienced some solicitude as to their support, while they were engaged in his cause. To give them, then, an assurance that although no temporal advantages could accrue to them from joining his standard, yet that they should not fail of that supply which was actually necessary for their subsistence, he points them to those objects in nature with which they were all familiar, and from the wise provision made for them, would lead them to repose with confidence on that gracious Being whose ear was open to the cry of the young raven, and who clothed the lilly in its gorgeous robe of glory. "Therefore, I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature? and why take ye thought for raiment? consider the lillies of the field, how they grow? they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you, Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?"

Our subject is one which inculcates the moral of humble reliance on God while in the faithful discharge of our duties, and it is to this particular point that your attention will be directed, noting as we pass along the considerations by which that dependence is enforced, and the grounds on which it is predicated. And here, I presume it will not be considered as going out of my way, if I state and reply to an objection which Infidelity has raised against the sentiments inculcated in these passages of Scripture. It has been remarked that a compliance with this requisition would be subversive of all industry and physical labour, and consequently reduce the human family to misery, poverty and want. If, for example, men were totally indifferent to making provision for food and raiment, destitution and starvation must be the result.—If again in those climates where prolific nature pours out her abundance, without the aid of agricultural labour and the warmth of the climate would render apparel not absolutely necessary, still under these favorable circumstances, an adherence to the injunction of the text would constitute man a listless, idle being, dragging out an existence not one remove from the beast, who has no higher aim than to satisfy the demands of appetite by plucking the wild herbage and slaking its thirst from the running brook. The command therefore contained in the text is in *many* cases impossible to be complied with, and under *all* circumstances of an immoral and dangerous tendency.

I believe that I have fairly stated the objection, and given it all its force, and I now proceed to reply to it. It appears to me that the whole of this reasoning is predicated on the supposition that those to whom these words were addressed, were to sit down in listless inactivity and wait as it were for the food to be put into their mouths. Still farther the application has been made *general*, and what was intended for a certain class of persons under very peculiar circumstances, has been extended to mankind considered in the aggregate. I consider both these suppositions erroneous and an evident departure from that fair construction which the connexion suggests. Let us recapitulate the circumstances. The language was addressed to the disciples, in view of the course of life they were about to pursue.---- This so far from being one of indolence and inactivity, was replete with labour, privation and toil. No one can follow them in their labours, and accuse them of enjoying a *sinecure*. They had to abandon the visible means of support, and to cast themselves on the charity, kindness and hospitality of those whose generous hearts would extend their sympathies, and whose liberal hands would supply the wants of men, who were devoting themselves to the cause of moral reformation and mental emancipation.—And the promise which was made tended to encourage them, by shewing that while thus pursuing the path of their duty, the gracious Being who was not unmindful of the feathered tenants of the air, and who decked the flowers of the field in their rich liveries, would not permit them to suffer for those necessaries which were indispensable for their support. The matter is sufficiently explained in the closing verses. "Therefore take no thought, saying what shall we eat? or what shall we drink? or wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek,) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought of the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Now let it be particularly remarked that the promise was only made in view of their performance of the duty required. They were to seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness in the first place, and then these things should be added unto them. It is therefore a manifest perversion of our Saviour's meaning to construe the expression in such a manner as to countenance the sentiment, that we may lie down in listless inactivity, till heaven shall shower down its manna upon us. This is widely departing

from the evident intention with which these words were uttered, and to urge this construction is as foreign to the Saviour's meaning as it is to candor and a fair interpretation of the passage.

I further remark that this injunction was not designed for *general* application. It had immediate respect to those alone who should engage in establishing the kingdom of Christ on earth. While these faithful ministers should be employed in their arduous undertaking, without money and without price, without scrip and without purse, with no certain prospect of even a bare subsistence, their heavenly Father who knew all their wants, would put it into the hearts of his people to extend to them the hand of charity, and amidst a crooked and perverse generation, some noble hearts would be found, who in consideration of their labour of love would administer to their necessities of their abundance. Such, I conceive, to have been the immediate application of the verses connected with the text, and I feel assured that every candid man, however opposed to the gospel of Jesus, will concede that there is nothing in this interpretation forced, unnatural or unreasonable.

I proceed then in pursuance of my original intention to inculcate the moral found in the text, to repose an implicit reliance on God while in the discharge of our duties. It has been remarked that the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, and the folly of worldy wisdom is never made more manifest, than when it leads men from the plain path of their duty from motives of human policy. There is a sentiment or opinion very prevalent, that a straightforward course of conduct and an open and honest avowal of our sentiments on the subject of religion, will so much interfere with our temporal prosperity, that prudence should dictate to us a profound silence on this subject. This is no less an erroneous than it is an injurious sentiment. To the operation of this unhallowed principle, half the mental bondage under which the world groans may be traced. It is this that rivets the iron fetter that is eating deep into the soul. It is this that snaps the lock which fastens that chain which binds down the prisoner in the dark dungeon-house of ignorance, superstition and error. Human policy! it is the idol which men worship. Before it principle bows, virtue stands abashed, and the voice of truth is as mute as the cold and lifeless tenant of the tomb. Go through the world and narrowly watch mankind; mingle in society and you will not be in want of examples of those who are actuated by these prudential motives. People wear two faces and use two tongues. There is one for the public expression of their opinions and the other for the private ear of friendship. Let me test this assertion by introducing to you such a character as you will meet with every day of your life. Yonder approaches a man, who has just returned from the house where he worships. Observe his countenance, it bears the marks of intelligence. Hear him speak, it is the language of soberness and good sense.—Converse with him on any subject and he gives evident tokens of a good understanding, and a correct judgment. Inquire into his manner of life, and you will find his dealings marked with integrity, and his words with veracity. He is temperate, charitable, exemplary. So far all is well, but you want an insight into his religious opinions. He has just come from hearing a discourse from a preacher, his own clergyman, which was marked with the most glaring inconsistencies and a violation of every principle of goodness, mercy and justice. He has seen the Deity held up in the most revolting light and represented as exercising unheard of barbarities towards his poor, weak, helpless and dependant offspring. You now inquire of this man, whom we will suppose to be your friend, and who has the most implicit reliance on your prudence and discretion, whether he approved of the minister's discourse. He unbosoms himself to you freely. Did he approve of it? No; he will honestly confess to you that his reason, understanding and judgment, were shocked at the contradictions and inconsistencies which he heard, and all the holier feelings of his nature rose in horror at the disgusting light in which he placed the God of all mercies and the Father of the spirits of all flesh. Yet he countenances and supports that which is actually repugnant to his judgement and revolting to his feelings, and would tremble if you should publish abroad what in confidence he has confided to your private ear. And should you ask him why he keeps silence on so interesting and important a subject, what will be his answer?—*human policy!!* He considers his interests identified with his profession of faith, and to that every other consideration must succomb. Do you imagine, my friends, that this is a fancy sketch, or a rare example? It is true to the life and the case with thousands. Did all the orthodox churches in the land disgorge such characters as these, they would have a great many vacant seats to let or to be sold. Were every man's real creed written in his forehead, our churches on the Sabbath day would present, what in popular language may be called, a *speckled* appearance and many would be found to have taken a seat in the wrong church.

If I may here be pardoned for the introduction of a personal allusion, I will narrate a circumstance admirably illustrative of the subject under consideration. A year or eighteen months before I made a public expression of my sentiments, when I was dilligently inquiring the way of truth and the scales were beginning to fall from my eyes, I was sitting in the study of a brother clergyman and accidentally laid my hand on a small book entitled, "The fulfillment of the prophecies as recorded in the xxivth of Matt." The farther I read the more interest was excited, and having finished the perusal, I exclaimed, "how is this? every particular in these remarkable prophecies, and which we have been accustomed to extend to a day of future judgment in another world, were literally fulfilled during that generation and on that peculiar people." "I *know* it, (says my friend, with much emphasis,) but take care to *say* nothing about it." Here, then, we see the operation of this *policy*. Here was a gentleman, a scholar, and *religious policy aside*, an amiable, charitable and honorable man. He had access to the same information as myself—he had seen the truth—he knew a more excellent way, and yet from prudential motives, he would hide all this light under a bushel.

That we may never, however, yield to the operation of this inglorious principle and suffer the apprehension of want to induce us to immolate truth on the altar of self-interest; the text addresses us with the language of encouragement. It teaches us to rely on the providential care and goodness of the Diety and feel the assurance that while in the conscientious discharge of our duty, he will take us under his guardian protection. This confidence is urged from several distinct considerations, which it now devolves upon us briefly to notice. In the first place allusion is made to the high character and moral and intellectual nature of man, "are ye not much better than they." As far as our knowledge extends, man is the most noble monument of God's creative power. As such he cannot but be the object of his care; nor can he be indifferent to the workmanship of his own hands. Having given to him a body to be clothed and a life to be supported by meat, he will make an ample provision for supplying the one and satisfying the other. "Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment." The actual gift of life is to the believer a certain pledge that he who gave that life will not be regardless of the means by which it is to be sustained. He looks with an impartial eye upon all his dependent offspring, and from the inexhaustible storehouse of his compassion and love he has poured forth a supply sufficient for the actual necessities of every living thing. Let us not then fear that in the dissemination of truth, we shall meet with actual want. It is true the prospects of the moral Reform may be dark and gloomy, but I know not how it is, except I refer it to the superintending care of Deity on which I am expatiating, that the bold and honest advocate of truth always manages to get along, even under the most discouraging circumstances. He will never be a loser, notwithstanding the cry of human policy, when all things are considered. He may not sleep on beds of down, but his sleep will be no less refreshing, when conscious rectitude has spread the couch and honesty made up the pillow. He may not feed on all the dainties and luxuries of life, but while he shares in the humble fare of those honest and ingenuous souls who are gratefully receiving the truth in love, his meal will be very sweet. When we add to this the freedom of mind, liberty of speech, rights of conscience, and the happy reflexion that he is carrying joy, and peace, and rejoicing to the saddened heart, and light and truth to the dim mental eye, there is a satisfaction far surpassing all the glittering pageantry that a vain and foolish world can offer. When (my dear hearers) circumstances have led me to that house of mourning, where a tender mother has been weeping with inexpressible anguish, over the remains of her beloved offspring, and while a cruel creed has taught her, that without certain religious experiences, that object of her love, who never professed to have enjoyed them, has descended to the dark regions of eternal wo;—and when I have been able to expose this bloody creed, to scatter its lying fragments to the four winds of heaven and wash out the foul stain that it had made on the bosom of a mother's love—when I have led her to rely with confidence on her God and the God of her child—and when the sweet conviction has seized her mind and the dark and tumultuous waves of sorrow that threatened to overwhelm her, have been rolled back—and when the light of joy and gratitude has beamed from that eye, so long sunken in the shades of despair—and when that bosom which had so long throbbed with anxious forebodings, was now beating quick, as the warm blood excited to action by kindling motions was rushing through the channels of the heart—and when that tongue mute from deep seated sorrow was now eloquent with gratitude and praise—one such hour—one such hallowed, happy, purifying scene, far outweighs all the pleasure *partialism* can bestow, though crowned with the mitre and domiciliated in a palace. Tell me not then that *truth* is *loss*, and *error gain*. Preach not the unsanctified doctrine that our interest lies in smothering the holy fire, deep in the recesses of our bosom. If we place all our happiness in the glittering dross, such may be the case, but if we have more ennobling views of happiness; if we value liberty, freedom and independance as the best sources of our comfort, then let us lift up our voices and proclaim these truths even from the housetops.

I would wish in conclusion to enforce upon you the consideration that, the honest and open avowal of our sentiments is the only means by which the desired truth can spread. Thousands and tens of thousands believing with us, will not destroy the reign of error and the power which it has usurped. It is the *public*, open, fearless expression of our sentiments, which is so loudly called for and which alone can prodcce the desired result. Then let every man within his sphere, extended or limited as his

circle may be, do all that he can to advance it. A small spark falling on combustible matter will kindle a large fire; and the word of truth fitly spoken will sometimes meet a ready acceptance and run and spread and be glorified. May the work of moral reformation and mental emancipation go hand in hand, till every vestige of superstition, error and delusion is banished from the earth. Amen.

Original.

PARTIALIST.

Notwithstanding the frequent use of the above term by many worthy and respectable writers of our faith, yet I, for one, am not convinced of the propriety of thus denominating the sincere christian who may happen to differ from us in the great question of a world's salvation. Why should we call our Arminian brethren Partialists? They do not profess to believe in a partial God, or in a partial atonement. And is it not unkind in us to attribute to them a sentiment they do not claim as their own, or rather one which they professedly reject? Is there not something harsh and severe in the term Partialist? To me it so appears; and I honestly confess it gives me pain whenever I find it in a Universalist publication. I am sensible that many Universalists who use the term, intend no invidiousness; but surely when our opposing brethren are addressed by this name it must have a tendency to beget unkind feelings, and to prejudice their minds against the person who addresses them, and every argument employed by him, however weighty. What if Universalists who use the term do not deem it an approbrious one, may not those who are addressed by it, have a different view of the word, and fancy they discover in it an uncharitable import? And if this be admitted, is it not our duty to forbear its use?

I was much pleased with Br. Sawyer's reasons for rejecting the term Orthodox, as the distinctive name of the believer in endless misery, and substituting *Limitarian*. In Vol. 1st, page 6th of the Messenger, he says, "This name" (limitarian) "we think appropriate, and it possesses none of the odium which attaches to Orthodox," &c. And will not the same objection weigh as heavily against the use of the term Partialist? Let charity answer. Perhaps I shall be accused of squeamishness, but really brethren can we not use some less objectionable term to designate those of a contrary faith from ourselves? If the word Limitarian is appropriate, why not adhere to it altogether? And this I believe Br. Sawyer has generally done, and I sincerely wish every Universalist throughout the United States would do the same. "Let things be called by their right names."

Brethren you who are strong, excuse my weakness, for thus entering my protest against the indiscriminate use of this word as a distinctive name for all those who differ from us in opinion respecting a world's salvation. O, let us not treat the sincere christian of whatever sect or belief, with even the semblance of harshness or severity. Let us avoid even the "*appearance* of evil." S. R. Sibley.

Stamford, Conn.

[FOR THE MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.]

Messrs. Editors—Having recently been on a visit to Hobart, Del. Co. N. Y., I was invited by my relatives to attend the Episcopal church, which I did, desirous to hear the preaching of that "Gospel which bringeth peace on earth, and good will to men."

With the minister's morning discourse I was much pleased, and at the same time somewhat surprized to hear a Partialist preacher utter such sentiments. His discourse was upon the subject of God's hardening Pharaoh's heart, which he explained very well. But in speaking of the fate of the king, he declared that the Scriptures were entirely silent as to his misery after death, and that mortal man should not pronounce judgment on him or any of our sinful race. He insisted that Pharaoh was punished in this world, agreeably to the declaration of scripture, viz. "The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, *much more* the wicked and the sinner," and quoted the words, "though hand join in hand the wicked *shall not go unpunished*." In short, he did not deliver a sentence in the discourse which appeared to me to favor the doctrine of endless misery in the least; but on the contrary cautioned his hearers to beware how they sentenced their sinful brethren to eternal punishment. A humane and charitable feeling seemed to pervade his whole sermon, which ought always to characterize the discourses of those who preach the gospel of peace and love.

In the afternoon his subject was faith—"we walk by faith and not by sight"—in which I am sorry to say he advanced ideas which appeared to me inconsistent with reason and scripture. I have stated that in the morning he cautioned his hearers against denouncing their fellow sinners, determining their fate to be infinite misery; but in the afternoon *he* boldly asserted that "we are to be happy or miserable forever according to our characters here." Now this appears to me like determining the fate of mankind without much ceremony, and it also appears somewhat contradictory to the sentiment advanced in the morning.

He advanced another idea which I deem altogether unscriptural, viz. that "Jesus Christ came to save mankind from eternal ruin." If mankind were in danger of eternal ruin or misery, who placed them in such a situation? Did the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! If so, then he sent his son to save men from the misery designed them, which I think would be contrary to the wisdom of an infinite unchangeable God. The truth is, Christ came to save the world from sin; and if he accomplishes what he came to do, there will be no sinners when his mediatorial reign shall end.

A desire to promote truth and expose error, is my only motive in penning these few remarks, and I presume no one will attribute to me any other disposition. And if I have erred in any statements made, let them be candidly pointed out. J. B. N.

Bridgeport, Ct. Aug. 1834.

SUSQUEHANNA CO. PA.

In the above county, the doctrine of Universalism is fixed upon a solid basis. There are already a number of societies formed for the purpose of propagating the truth. And there is a large field for labouring, open to any of our ministering brethren who may feel disposed to visit that region.

Br. Rogers and myself, are at present the only labourers in this extensive field. And having in prospect a Pioneering tour through the western part of Pennsylvania, I would respectfully suggest to any of my ministering brethren, who can make it convenient, the propriety of visiting that section of country, and supplying the people with the preached word of life.

Samuel Ashton.

New-York, Aug. 4th, 1834.

DEDICATION AT REAMSTOWN.

The information communicated in the following extract of a letter from Br. Moore, of Reading, is truly gratifying.—The good work is prospering. The leaven of the Gospel is operating. Pennsylvania is coming. Bless the Lord, O my soul! A. C. T.

"The new Universalist Meeting-House recently erected in Reamstown, Lancaster county, was dedicated to the worship of the One Living and True God, on Sunday the 27th of July. Six sermons were preached on the occasion, by Brs. Myers and Longenecker and myself—Brs. M. and L. in the German language. [Br Moore preached the Dedication Sermon.]

Notwithstanding the extreme heat of the day, a large audience was in attendance, some of which had come from a distance of 18 miles. Such perfect order and decorum I never knew to prevail in so large an assembly, as was observed throughout the day. Both inside and outside the house, all was quietness and attention. The brethren had taken the precaution to put up a large awning around the house, which rendered the outside more pleasant than the inside. And indeed, not more than half the friends present could get into the building, which is of stone, 28 feet by 24. On first approaching it, my attention was arrested by the following inscription, which is placed a few feet above the entrance: "Here dwells liberty. 2 Cor. iii, 17."—God grant that his Spirit, which is the Spirit of that Truth which maketh free indeed, may ever dwell there.

It may be proper to add, that our friends in Reamstown intend their house not only for a place of worship, but also for a school, and that it will always be *free* for any denomination of Christians to worship in, when not occupied by themselves. Br. Myers will minister to them a part of his time.—May the great Head of the Church shower down his choicest blessings upon both preacher and people, and make them patterns of good works."

ANOTHER PREACHER.

By the Religious Inquirer and Gospel Anchor. We learn that Br. James Shrigley, formerly of Holden, Mass. but now a resident of Stafford, Conn. has just commenced preaching the impartial grace of God in the final ingathering of all men to holiness and happiness. May a success commensurate with his most ardent desires attend his labors.

HONESDALE, PA.

A letter from a valued friend in this place, recently received, gives a flattering prospect of our cause in that section. Br. Rogers has been with them a week or two. They were to meet on the 18th ult. to form a Society, and had opened a subscription for building a church, with a fair prospect of accomplishing the object within the year. May abundant success attend their exertion. The Books will be forwarded as he desires. He will perceive by the Religious notices, that Br. Ashton is to preach there on Wednesday evening, 20th inst.

CHENANGO ASSOCIATION.

The Magazine and Advocate gives notice that the Chenango Association of Universalists will meet at Hamden, Del. co. N, Y. on the last Wednesday and Thursday of the present month (August.)

Religious Notices.

Ev. S. J Hillyer will preach in Longridge Sunday August 17th; and at half past 5 o'clock of the same day at Poundridge.

Br. Samuel Ashton will preach at Branchville, N. J. on the 2d Sunday in August; at Honesdale, Pa. the following Wednesday evening; and at Harford on the 3d Sunday in August.

Br. James McLaurin will preach in Monroe, Sunday, Aug. 10th.

Br. Bullard will preach in Meredith, Delaware county, on Tuesday, August 19th, 5 o'clock, P. M.; at Harpersfield on Wednesday 20th, 5 P. M; at Hobart, on Thursday 21st in the evening; at Walton, on Sunday 24th, forenoon and afternoon; and at Hamden, 5 P. M. same day. Societies will be formed in all of the four last mentioned places, agreeably to previous legal notice.

Br. F. Hitchcock will preach in New-London, Conn. the 3d and 4th Sundays in August; in Groton, Tuesday evening the 19th; and in Norwich Wednesday evening the 20th.

213 Questions and Answers.

We have now ready for sale at No. 2 Chatham-Square, N. Y. and 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia, the 12 Nos. of the Messenger and Universalist containing the above Questions, Answers and Rejoinders, in pamphlet binding—price 37 1-2 single, $3,50 cents per doz.

Hymn Books, &c.

A new supply of Streeter's Hymns,
A few copies of Smith on Divine Government,
Do. do. Paige's Selections.

Just received and for sale at the office of the Messenger, No. 2, Chatham-square, foot of Bowery, N. Y.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1834.

FAITH OF ABRAHAM.

The unwavering confidence reposed by Abraham in the promise of the Deity—his unyielding faith that God was abundantly able to accomplish all his benevolent designs—furnishes a suitable and profitable theme for Christian meditation.

When Abraham was well stricken with years, having as yet no offspring but Ishmael, Jehovah promised that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." "Against hope, he believed in hope." He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform." And the confidence of the "father of the faithful" was not misplaced. Descended from Isaac, through a long succession of patriarchs, kings and prophets, Jesus, the promised seed, was born in Bethlehem.

Paul, in writing of the promise made to Abraham, terms it the *Gospel*, that is, *glad tidings*. "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Paul moreover testifies that Christ was the promised seed; and certifies that justification through faith was the promised blessing.

When Jesus was in the flesh, he said, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day; he saw it, and was glad." He saw it by faith—for "he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief." His rejoicing and gladness were consequent of his faith. He gave glory to God, being *strong* in faith; and he was *filled* with rejoicing, because he was "*fully* persuaded that what God had promised, he was able also to perform."

Paul states, that "they who are of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham." That is, they are blessed in like manner. He who believes as did Abraham, will rejoice and be glad.

When we look around us in the professedly religious world, we find many who are drunken, even to staggering, with the spirit of unbelief. We state the promises of God as distinctly as we can, and bring forth, a "thus saith the Lord" for each of his assurances of love—but alas! how few are there who flee for refuge to the hope set before them! They *desire* that the divine promises may prove true, and their desires to this effect are constantly expressed in their prayers; but being destitute of the requisite faith, they are not blessed with faithful Abraham. They indeed see by faith what they consider the day of Christ—but to them it is a day of darkness and dismay. They cannot rejoice and be glad. How different would be the state of their minds, could they but be *strong* in the faith of the Gospel! and how changed the scene, were they but fully persuaded that all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed in Christ!

Our unbelieving brethren cannot see how the wickedness of men can be removed—nor how the vail of unbelief can be taken away. We can assure them, that when the vail is removed from *their own eyes*, they will see all things clearly. When they can be brought to believe, with full assurance of faith, in the promised "reconciliation of all things," they will rejoice and be glad. They will then be, like Lazarus, in Abraham's bosom—in the Abrahamic covenant of faith. Until then, they must expect to be tormented in the flame of unbelief.

And here, it may be proper to mention, that our staggering brethren are in possession of the right faith, so far as salvation is its object. The difficulty is, their faith is *not strong enough*—it is not sufficiently *extensive*. They believe that themselves and their connexions are embraced in the promises of grace—but then their faith is not strong enough to furnish justifiable grounds for the gladness and rejoicing experienced by Abraham. Nor is it sufficiently extensive. We are all members one of another—and when one member suffers, all the members must suffer with it.—We cannot avoid feeling some interest in the welfare of others. He, therefore, whose faith in God's mercy is either weak or limited, cannot reasonably expect to feel the joy of one who is *strong* in faith, and who is *fully* persuaded that what God hath promised he is able to perform.

Now all we wish to effect among our unbelieving brethren is, to strengthen and enlarge their faith. We wish to bring them to such a state of mind, that they will exclaim, as with one voice, "Lord, we believe; help thou our unbelief." We feel sorry that they stagger at the promises—for God is wise, and good, and powerful—and nought but the spirit of error can induce doubting, or wavering, or sorrow, as to the issue of the divine economy. We wish them to acknowledge an infinite fulness in the gospel of Christ—we wish them to behold, by the eye of faith, the complete fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham—then, and not till then, can their faith be accounted to them for righteousness. Then and not till then, can they be blessed with the father of the faithful. Then, and not till then, can they rejoice and be glad, when contemplating the issue of the reign of Christ. May the Lord hasten the happy time, when his children shall see eye to eye, and rejoice together in "the faith once delivered to the saints."

A. C. T.

"A WHOLE FAMILY IN HEAVEN."

We have before us Tract No. 298, of the American Tract Society, under the above title. The reflections are predicated on the expression of a Christian Mother in a letter to her husband, just before her death, in the following terms:—"I rejoice in the hope that we shall meet, an unbroken family, before the throne of God." The writer of the tract, responds, "What a delightful thought—*a whole family in heaven!*" He appeals to the reader, "How happy will you be to *meet every member of your own family* in heaven!—not one wanting. Father and mother, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, servants and apprentices—all there: all who surrounded the family table—all who knelt together around the family altar—however separated by distance or time, yet meeting in heaven at last." Who will not applaud him for his benevolent aspirations? It is, indeed, "a delightful thought," and where is the *christian*, whose heart will not dilate with joy in the bare reflection of such a result.

Reader, let us extend the application, a trifle. "I rejoice in hope, that in the 'dispensation of the fulness of times," the whole sentient creation shall meet, an unbroken family, (for hath not one God created us?) before the throne of God." "O blissful morning, when my eyes shall gaze on this redeemed family," all assembled in the heavenly mansions of their Father and their God! Yes, *all* assembled—"Fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, servants—all are there!" Not *one* absent—no parting pangs to mar the joy of an assembled universe!—no piercing shrieks ascending up from a deep yawning abyss, telling of the unutterable wo of some dear parent, or son, or daughter, or brother, or sister—dear even in their waywardness. No; all are happy; all are joyous; all are prepared to shout the christian's triumph, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive honor, and glory, and power; for thou hast created all things; and for thy PLEASURE THEY ARE AND WERE CREATED." Is there a *christian* who can object to such a consummation? Impossible!

The author of the tract says:

"What a cheering circumstance it is when *one* in a family, by repenting of sin, and believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, has chosen heaven for his portion! Look at that man. Mark him well. Set it down as a certainty that he will not go to heaven alone. He cannot be satisfied to walk solitarily in the way of Zion. He must have companions, and he will use every means, that, through God's blessing, he may bring others to Christ. We anticipate great things from such a character, and well we may, for God says to every new convert, "I will bless thee, and thou shalt be a blessing." From the day of his conversion he begins to pray, and "the effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much." He also begins to "shine," and he "giveth light unto all that are in the house."—To such a friend I would say, O watch for their souls. Look up to God for divine guidance, that you may act wisely in your station. Never be discouraged. Let the hope of bringing a whole family to heaven animate, quicken you. In the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength; and when you are leaning simply on him, he will make you almost forget your own weakness by the assurance that his arm is almighty."

Yes, note him who has embraced the gospel of Christ, and "chosen heaven for his portion." "Mark him well." "He will not go to heaven *alone*." "He must have companions," *or it would be no heaven to him*; and although he is frequently told by the over-righteous, that if they only had a moiety of his confidence in his Creator, THEY *never would trouble themselves about religion*, but would *take their fill of sin!* yet *he* is constrained to "use every means, that through God's blessing, he may bring others to Christ." In other words, that he may be instrumental in imparting to others a knowledge of that truth which maketh free indeed. Well may we "anticipate great things from such a character."—"He begins to pray," and he prays "in faith," too, "nothing doubting," that the wisdom and power of his heavenly Father will effectually accomplish the glorious promise, "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he will gather together in ONE, all things in Christ;" the multiplied assertions of unbelief to the contrary notwithstanding. Such a person will "look up to God for guidance." He "cannot be discouraged." The confident hope of meeting the "whole" human "family in heaven," will "animate and quicken" him in his exertions to establish in the minds of others the same joyful hope, that they also may enjoy with him a present *consequence*, as set forth by the Apostle, "we which have believed *do* enter into rest"—*now*—not some countless ages hence.

The author deems it "alarming" indeed, "when *one* in a family gives evidence that he is *not preparing for heaven!*"

"O how can we bear to think of a whole family in heaven but one! Whom should we select to be that miserable absentee? Whose child should we pitch upon? Whose brother should we mark as the victim? Does not our blood run cold? Do not our hearts shudder at the thought? Are we not all ready to exclaim, "Let not this misery fall on one of mine?"—Now, parents, now is the time. Is there one in your family not preparing for heaven? What ought to be done in his case? Shall you let him alone? O no. Let your tears flow. Let your prayers ascend. Let your hearts melt. Let your language pierce his soul. O follow him. Determine never to give him up until you have reclaimed the prodigal---until you have snatched the firebrand from the flame; then you may go on your way, rejoicing in hope, that all your family will meet in heaven."

Apply this to the race of man. The whole human family in heaven—*save one!* Truly, "whom shall we select to be that miserable absentee?" Partialist friend, have you ever brought this question home to your own business and bosom. Have you ever looked upon it as possible that *yourself* might be that miserable outcast from heaven and happiness? Have you ever singled out a parent, a companion, a child, or even a dear friend, as that hopeless object, and in view of it, prayed in sincerity, "*Thy will, O God, be done?*" No, no!—*never* have you done this in the full possession of that reason which God hath given you to elevate you above the brute that perisheth. Your "blood" must in truth "run cold." It must curdle around your very heart, sealing up those pure streams of sympathy and affection which prompt you to every thing noble and God-like. Your very brain must become dizzy—your heart sick, and you become a cold *blank* in the world of thought and rational being. Who can contemplate a scene like this in calmness? And yet, alas! how many testimonies to its truth have been furnished us, in only a few years past.

Again, what a comment in the closing part of the last quotation, does the author give us on the enduring kindness and benevolence of our Creator. He gives to the weak, frail, earthly parent an affection for its offspring which never flags—never tires; but which will follow an erring child to the very depths of all degradation, until it has "reclaimed the prodigal;" and yet he can award to our heavenly Parent, the Father of all mercies, a worse than brutish indifference to the welfare of his offspring, the family of man; for brutes manifest affection for their kind. He in effect represents the Deity stoically addressing mankind after this wise:—

"Though you have widely strayed from the path of obedience and rectitude, and are utterly unable of yourselves to change your condition in the least, I am *willing* you should be restored,—that you should return to duty and consequent happiness—*but you must first purify yourselves.* I am wil-

ling, yea *anxious*, for you to return, and if you will *only* COME *to me*, (though I *know* you cannot walk,) *I will* GRACIOUSLY *receive you*" ! !

The following may be a very correct view of consequences, under the government of such a Deity as this Tract would present for our worship.

"How dreadful will it be to see *a whole family in hell!* And is there not reason to fear that many whole families are already there? Awful thought! See them shut up in endless despair. O, see them in the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. And are there not whole families at this moment on their way thither, to whom not one word of solemn, friendly, godly counsel has been given, who have never once been warned to flee from the wrath to come?"

Thanks, however, be to the God of the whole earth, such is not His character. He is a God who "doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men," but when he "chasteneth," he doth it for our profit, "that we may be partakers of his holiness." "He will not contend forever, neither will he be always wroth," for the plain reason that "the spirit would fail before him, and the souls that he has made." And hence our unshaken confidence in that glorious consummation, which even the author of this Tract, in some parts of it, seems so ardently to desire.

It seemeth to us strange, how any one, after thus catching but a bare glimpse, as it were, of the light of life and salvation, can again return to the rayless view of Partialism. But so it is. The heart-withering influence of worldly creeds converts man into a monster, in his *profession*, and quite too frequently exert their saddening influence on his *practice*.—Reader, let it be our business to supplicate the bountiful giver of every good and perfect gift, to graciously preserve us from their gloomy forebodings—that we may ever lean upon Him with a child-like confidence, and in the inimitable sentiment of Watts, look beyond the "flood" of death, with an eye steadily fixed upon that "land of pure delight,"

"Where everlasting spring abides,
And never-withering flowers."

Then may we in calmness and resignation meet the many changing scenes of life, in the full assurance that we shall at last unite with a "whole family"—the family of man—in songs of rejoicing, and ceaseless praise, in heaven our home.

P.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of July 31, 1834.]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 9.

Philadelphia, July 25th, 1834.

Dear Sir,—Several of the periodical papers of the Universalists have conjectured, very reasonably, that my deep concern in the ecclesiastical controversies now pending in the Presbyterian Church, has caused my delay in answering your two last letters, and in pursuing our amicable discussion. The newspapers published by your denomination of persons in the United States, seem to be almost exclusively devoted to one *object*,—that of convincing all men, that however they may live and die, they shall all infallibly be holy and happy in an immortal future state of being. Your example, in most of these publications, of sending forth weekly some sermon with the proper name of the author attached to it, I deem worthy of imitation. Our newspapers take a more extensive scope, and treat of every thing, by turns, in which our fellow men may be supposed to be interested. *The Philadelphian*, you are aware, is of this general character; while its peculiar bearing is on the ecclesiastical concerns of that church of which the editor is a minister. I cannot, therefore, pursue any one subject of discussion to the exclusion of twenty other objects of attention. And yet, could I suppose any considerable number of Universalists likely to be convinced, by the plainest assurances of the word of God, of the truth that some shall be lost for ever, and thereby induced to prepare to meet their God in peace, I should think myself happy in editing a paper for their sole benefit.

It has often occurred to me to ask, what profit can Mr. Thomas expect will be derived to any one from his doctrine, even if it is true? Men may be saved, and certainly will be saved, if his theory is correct, whatever may be their opinions about Universalism. Belief in his doctrine is not at all connected with salvation. It is not, therefore, as a means of salvation that he would write and preach on the doctrine of universal salvation. His gospel, if it is a gospel at all, is not the power and wisdom of God unto salvation, for salvation would come to all men independently of any knowledge of this good news.

It has also occurred to me to inquire, if Mr. Thomas has ever known the preaching of the doctrine of universal salvation to be the means of reforming the moral conduct of any wicked man? I do not deny, that a Universalist may teach many of the truths of the Bible, and that they may be the means of amending the life; but did the proclamation, that all men, live and die as they may, shall infallibly be happy in heaven, ever bring any sinner to repentance; ever make any drunkard become a sober man; ever render any polluted mortal chaste—or ever incline a prayerless and graceless man to pray, and serve God in a spiritual manner? I do not *affirm* that this never was the case, but I ask for the candid testimony of a Universalist on this subject. A gospel which does not make a transgressor cease from doing evil and learn to do well is not profitable for the life *which now is*, even if it should show all to be safety in that *which is to come*.

I do not honestly apprehend, that Universalism is productive of any other benefit than that of quieting the consciences of the wicked, and filling them with hope of final safety, though they continue impenitent in the practice of the worst crimes to which they are inclined. While there are allowedly respectable and moral people in the ranks of Universalists, I seriously ask you, Sir, if the mass of any Universalist congregation of your acquaintance can be declared equal in point of sobriety, industry, and good general moral character, to the mass of any congregation of equal numbers in which the doctrine of future punishment is inculcated?

But I am reminded, that the question is, *what say the sacred Scriptures?* Do they teach the future, everlasting punishment of some of the human family? or the future holiness and happiness of every individual? I have affirmed the former; you the latter. We have been running on collaterally, each in the citation of Scripture to prove his own proposition, and to disprove that of his opponent. I confess, freely, that my object has been, and still will be, not so much to discuss passages critically, for the benefit of the learned, who may not thank us for our labour, as to present in a popular form such plain and scriptural arguments, citations and illustrations, as in my judgment ought to convince every unprejudiced reader of the Bible that some sinners will be miserable forever. If in some instances I have slid further into critical disquisition than I had originally intended, it has been with a desire to convince you, Sir, of the truth. Mainly I have written for the generality of our readers; I presume you have done the same: but at times the aspiration arises, *Oh that he were wise: that he understood these things; that he would consider his latter end!*

My *opinion* that a part of Matt. xxiv. refers to a future state is founded on the fact that the disciples asked two questions: 1st. What shall be the sign of thy coming? 2dly. What shall be the sign of the end of the world? and on the language of our Saviour's answer. Had they not proposed an inquiry concerning *the end of the world*, as distinct from the time of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, we might not have looked for an answer. He told them of his coming in the last verse of the preceding chapter; and in the 2d verse of this chapter he assured them concerning the buildings of the temple, "there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." It was therefore very natural they should ask, *When shall these things be*, that thou hast predicted? *What shall be the sign of thy coming*, of which thou hast just spoken? And, as they supposed the world was then to come to an end, *What shall be the sign of the end of the world?*

You agree with me, that from the 4th to the 35th verse Christ answers the question concerning his coming to the destruction of Jerusalem: concerning which he said, "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." By *generation* here you seem to understand the Jews then living; and all of them did not pass before Jerusalem was destroyed. This, however, is not the exclusive sense of a *generation*, in the Bible, for all the Jews, from the beginning to the end of the world constitute *one generation* of men: and all lying and wicked men belong to one generation of vipers. You affirm that the latter part of the 24th chapter from the 36th verse to the end refers also to the same coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. I think it refers to a future coming of Christ, because it is an evident answer to the last question which his disciples had asked, and because by the disjunctive conjunction he turns from the time of which he had been speaking, and says, "But, of that day and hour knoweth no man." He then proceeds to say that "as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." He shall come on mankind suddenly, when they do not expect him; and shall sweep multitudes away, dividing some from others. He does not say, that all these things, spoken after the 35th verse, but all those spoken of before it, shall take place, "before this generation pass." Because Christ shall come unexpectedly to the final judgment, he commands all his disciples, saying, "Therefore, be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh." "THEN," when the son of man shall come as the flood in the days of Noah, "shall two be in one field; the one shall be taken and the other left:" or separation shall be made even between persons engaged in the same field of labor; and then shall the lord of the unfaithful servant "cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." "THEN," also, says Christ in the next chapter, "shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins," five of whom were foolish, had no oil in their vessels, were unprepared for the coming of the bridegroom, "and the door was shut." Afterward they came crying, "Lord, Lord, open to us: but he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know ye not. Watch, therefore, and pray, for ye know neither the day nor the hour, wherein the Son of Man cometh."

How can they be saved who are not prepared to meet Christ at his last coming to our world, and whom he will not acknowledge?

"For he is as a man travelling into a far country," says Christ of himself, Matt. xxv. 14. for *the kingdom of heaven*, as I have before remarked, is erroneously supplied in italic print by the translators: "For he [the Son of Man] is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods. After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and reckoneth with them." The Son of Man who has gone away into heaven, that country far from earth, and who has intrusted us with all the different talents we possess, will act in like manner; will come to judge all his subjects. "Then," to wit, in the end of the world, "he that had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee, that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed, &c. His Lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant," and finally gave commandment, "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Pursuing the same theme and still answering the question concerning the signs of the end of the world, the Redeemer says, in simple verity, without a parable, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." It has never been shown by yourself, or any one, that this which you call a *parable* of the sheep and goats, to whose separation at night allusion is made, has reference to events which have long since transpired. Why need I quote any more? To the end of the chapter Christ teaches in the clearest terms how he will act in the end of the world, when all nations shall be gathered before him. This is an event which has not yet arrived, and refers to a judgment yet to come on all mankind. If you assert, that the nations have ever yet all been gathered before the Son of Man, and divided according to their character, I ask you when? and where? It is not until we arrive at the first verse of the xxvi th, chapter, that we learn Jesus "had finished all these sayings," which he uttered after coming out of the temple, being pointed to its massy stones, and having predicted its demolition. From the 36th verse of the xxivth chapter to the end of the xxvth, Jesus discourses in reply to the last inquiry of his pupils. If you can make the declaration, "these shall go away into everlast-

ing punishment but the righteous into life eternal," I mean temporal judgments brought on the Jews, I must think your principles of interpretation wrong, because they render the Bible an uncertain, unmeaning rule of faith.

I do not admit that Christ ever acknowledged *his inability to inform* his disciples of the time when the end of the world shall be. Your favorite McKnight may show you that Christ said, *no man maketh known that day*. It was revealed to no mere man, and Christ did not see fit *to make known* the precise time "when he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." This *second* time of his appearing I may remark, when he shall come not as a sin offering but as a judge, is to be after men have died, for "as it appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him will he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. ix, 27, 28.

Because Mark and Luke record one of the questions which the disciples asked Christ, it does not follow that Matthew was not correct in stating two or three. Several true witnesses may testify to several different circumstances, and all which they all attest is to be credited. In Luke xvii, 20—37, Christ discoursed about the destruction of Jerusalem in answer to the Pharisees, and used expressions very similar to those which he employed on another occasion, when his *disciples* asked about the end of the world. I DO NOT ADMIT, therefore that Matt. xxiv, 36—41, and Luke xvii, 26—37, are parallel passages. This, however, is true, that the coming of Christ at the end of the world shall in many particulars be like his coming to judge Jerusalem in the time of her destruction by the Romans: and this has led many to conclude that Christ's prophecy concerning his coming must have a *double* meaning and a two-fold accomplishment.

It is true, that to your arguments intended to prove, that the faithful and obedient have the whole of everlasting life in this world, I have failed to reply; for if you mean that to know God and Jesus Christ is everlasting life begun in the soul, I agree; but if you mean that everlasting life is not a benefit promised to all believers to be enjoyed forever and ever after it is begun here, why it seems to me needless and trifling to undertake to show that everlasting life does mean everlasting life, and not merely the life which the good live in this fleeting state.

You wish me to know, that the Almighty is to be regarded as *endless* in duration, not because some derivative of the Greek word *aion* (always being) is applied to him, but because we read of *aphthartos Theou*, the *incorruptible* God. Rom. i. 23.—You confess that *aionion* expresses an unlimited duration in 2 Cor. v, 1, but think that the terms used in I Peter i, 4 such as *aphthartos* incorruptible, and *amarantos*, unfading, and in Heb. vii, 16, *akatalutos*, endless, are much stronger.

The very passage you quote from Heb. vii, 16, if you add the next verse, will prove that this is a false pretense; for Jesus is said to be made a priest after the power of an *endless life, (zoes akatalutou)* for this reason, that God had testified, thou art a priest *forever, eis ton aiona*. Thus his *endless life* as a priest, resulted from his being made by divine appointments a priest *forever, eis ton aiona*. A life, indissoluble, that is *akatalutos*, is the result of an *aionion* decree, or appointment. *Aionios*, therefore, is stronger than *akatalutos*, according to the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is "because he continueth ever he hath an *unchangeable* priesthood." Heb. vii, 24.

You say, "I have shown that *aionion* is not unequivocal in its signification; and I will add, that your argument in proof of endless punishment will be essentially improved, if you can find the words *aphthartos, amarantos, akatalutos*, or either of them applied to punishment in the Bible."

I reply, that *akatalutos* signifies *without dissolution*, or not *to be dissolved*, and *zoes akatalutos*, a *life without dissolution* is freely rendered *endless* in Heb. vii, 16, in opposition to one's death, or dissolution. but the words employed to denote *punishment* could not without great incongruity, and confusion of metaphor, be coupled with these terms which you pronounce more unequivocal than *aionios, endless*. The sacred writers had too much good taste to write of *incorruptible fire, indissoluble burnings*, or *unfading punishment*. We may with good sense and taste speak of *endless* or *aionion* fire, burnings, punishment, death, and life; hence we read, Matt. xxv, 46, "these shall go away into *endless punishment, eis kolasin aionion*, but the righteous *eis zoen aionion* into endless life." The words *thanatos, death; olethros, destruction; pur, fire; kolasis, punishment; apoleias, perdition; thlipsis, tribulation; krisis, damnation*; and the like, I repeat it, may well be qualified by *interminable, endless*, and *everlasting;* but it would be a violation of congruity to qualify them by *incorruptible, unfading*, and *indissoluble;* as much so as to speak of an *audible sight*, or of a *tangible vision*. It is unreasonable therefore, to require that the doctrine of endless punishment shall be proved, if proved at all, by finding incongruous affinities, and violations of propriety in the sacred oracles. In connection with the fire of punishment threatened the term *unquenchable* is used, and has the same force as *indissoluble*. when connected with life; for a fire *never quenched* and a life *never dissolved* must each be *endless*. Moreover, in Mark ix. 43. and Matt xviii. 8. *to pur to aionion* and *to pur to asbeston*, that is *aionion* or *everlasting fire*, and *unquenchable fire* are used as synonymous.

If my life is spared, it is my design to pay some attention to your last letter in my next.

Yours respectfully, EZRA STILES ELY.

To Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely.—Letter 9.

Philadelphia, August 2, 1834.

Dear Sir—Your remarks and inquiries concerning the influence and tendency of Universalism would be very proper, were they relevant to the question in debate. But they are *not*—for our present inquiry is simply, *Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the Bible? or does the Bible teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?* I am utterly indisposed to countenance the introduction of matters foreign to the point at issue. So soon as our present question is finally disposed of, I will be ready and willing to meet you in discussion of the influence and tendency of our sentiments respectively, should you feel disposed to engage in such discussion.

Lest, however, your remarks should make an unfavorable impression on the minds of some of our readers, I will so far gratify you as to say, distinctly, that, in my judgment, the practical utility of any doctrine is the strongest presumptive evidence that can be given of its truth; that a demoralizing doctrine should neither be believed nor taught; that I believe Universalism to be the doctrine of God, who revealed it and commanded it to be preached to all nations for the obedience of faith; that I prize it for its moralizing tendency and comforting influence; and that I *know* it has been instrumental in converting the drunkard, the profane-swearer, the profligate, and other vile persons, from the error of their ways. I farther certify you, that I solemnly believe such conversions to be the legitimate effects of the doctrine of Universalism. Moreover, I feel much satisfaction in being enabled to testify, that the societies of Universalists in this city and elsewhere, *can* be, and are hereby "declared to be equal in point of sobriety, industry and good general moral character," to any societies in which the doctrine of endless punishment is inculcated. I say, *equal*—and will add, if they are not *better*, better men, women, parents, children, neighbors, citizens, they do not come up to the standard of the faith.

On the other hand, I sincerely believe that the doctrine of endless punishment is exceedingly baleful in its influence—dishonorable to God—injurious to mankind, and detrimental to human enjoyment. I believe its natural tendency to be, to corrupt and circumscribe the operations of that love which is greater than faith or hope—to make of man the enemy of man—to foster spiritual pride and self-righteousness—to make sad the hearts of the righteous whom the testimony of Jesus will *not* make sad—and to strengthen the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, by putting afar the day of evil, and by promising him an escape from the just demerit of his iniquities. I believe that all the persecutions, which have filled the world with blood, and groans, and tears, originated in the principles of Partialism. In a word, I am fully persuaded that the doctrine of endless punishment stands directly opposed to the nature, perfections, will and promise of God—that it is at war with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ—that it composes no part of Divine Revelation—that it is repugnant to right reason and to all the holiest aspirations of the human heart—and that its natural tendency is to evil in all its Protean forms. I say these things, not by way of retaliation, but because I am solemnly and sincerely convinced of their truth.

You ask me what good can be derived to any one from Universalism, even if it is true. You seem to think that as all men will eventually be saved, (according to this doctrine,) it matters not what evils they may suffer in the present life!! Besure, you use other language—but such is the substance of your remarks. Allow me to ask you, why any one should desire to be cured of a painful disease, seeing that his body will suffer no pain in the grave? Why should a blind man wish to see, a deaf man too hear, a dumb man to speak, or a lame man to walk, each being fully satisfied that his malady can afflict him only in the present life? You possess too much discernment to overlook the bearing, and too much candor to deny the force of these queries. You speak of salvation as of a matter *wholly* pertaining to the immortal state of being. In this you err. Allow me to assure you, that Universalism, *is* "the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth," and to no other persons—for "he that believeth not shall be *damned*"—and "this *is* the *condemnation*, that light is come *into the world*, and men love darkness rather than light."

There is one other part of your irrelevant observations which I desire to notice. You speak of Universalist periodical publications as being "almost exclusively devoted *to one object*—that of convincing all men, that however they may live and die, they shall all be infallibly holy and happy in an immortal future state of being." Why did you not add, for the information of your readers, that though "*the restitution of all things*, which God had spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," is the prominent and leading doctrine of our papers, other and correlative subjects engage our earnest and constant attention? You, sir, have not perused our written labors to so little profit, as to be ignorant of the fact, that we incessantly urge the utility of, and the necessity for, "repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."—We "affirm *constantly*, that they who have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works," for "these things are good and profitable unto men." We hold that "the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared—teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly in the present world"—for he alone can be truly happy, who is a practical disciple of "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."

I have thus noticed many of your remarks, which obviously do not belong to the point at issue; and I beg leave to repeat, that I will not consent to discuss these matters in detail, until our present question shall have been finally disposed of. You will not dispute the propriety of this determination.

Your argument on Matt. xxiv, et seq. is substantially the same as presented in previous letters. You have neglected to notice my reasoning on many points connected with the coming of the Son of Man. I therefore propose to bring the subject more fully into view. Its importance is obvious—for, having admitted that a part of the chapter refers to events which transpired at the destruction of Jerusalem, and believing that the remainder refers to the immortal state of being, you found it necessary to point out the verse at which you suppose the transition of reference to take place. You selected verse 36. You could not have chosen any other—for the preceding context shut you out entirely; and you clearly perceived that the *adverbs of time* in Matt. xxv, required you either to stop at verse 36 of Matt. xxiv, or to allow that neither of the chapters furnishes any proof of the point you desire to establish. This, then, is a plain statement of the case. Let us proceed to the argument.

1st. You say, the disciples "proposed an inquiry concerning *the end of the world*, as distinct from the time of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem." In reply, I remark, 1st. I have several times desired you to notice the fact, that the word translated *world* in the phrase "end of the world," is not *kosmos*, the *material* world, but *aion*, the age. Therefore, the assertion that the disciples "supposed the [material] world was to come to an end" at the coming of the Son of Man is groundless, and your argument is lost.—2d. In verses 6, 13, 14 of Matt. xxiv, "*the end*" is distinctly spoken of in immediate connexion with the signs that should precede the destruction of Jerusalem. "Ye shall hear of wars . . . . . but THE END [*what* end?] is not yet . . . . . There shall be famines and pestilences . . . . all these are the *beginning* of sorrows, [*what* sorrows?] *Then* shall they deliver you up to be afflicted . . . . but he that shall endure unto *the end*, [*what* end?]

the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto *all nations*, [see Matt. xxv, 32, in which it is declared that *all nations* should be gathered before the Son of Man,] and then shall *the end* come. *When* ye, *therefore*, shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet . . . . *then* let them which be *in Judea flee into the mountains*: let him which is on the house top not come down to take any thing out of his house," etc. Who can avoid perceiving that all these things, including *the end* spoken of, were to transpire at the destruction of Jerusalem? But 3d. the disciples asked only *two* questions: "When shall these things be?" viz. the desolation of the Temple; "and what shall be THE SIGN *of thy coming* AND *of the end of the world?*" thus inquiring for THE SIGN of *simultaneous events*. It was "IMMEDIATELY *after* the tribulation of those days," viz. the destruction of Jerusalem, that "THE SIGN of the Son of Man" was to appear in heaven, verse 30, and then the Son of Man would be seen coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. That was also THE SIGN of *the end of the world* under the law. Then the old covenant was to be abolished, and the reign of Christ in the kingdom which the Father had appointed him, was then to commence.

2d. You offer some remarks on the word "generation," but the state of the case is not altered thereby—for you have admitted that all of the persons "then living did not pass to their graves before Jerusalem was destroyed;" and you have conceded that to the 35th verse inclusive, the language of Jesus referred to that destruction, and not to any thing yet future. I desire you to remember, that you do not suppose any transition of reference until you reach the 36th verse of the chapter. At that point your argument commences; and you seem to think that the disjunctive conjunction "*but*," settles the question as to said transition. "*But of that day*"——WHAT *day?* Plainly, the day of which our Savior had so particularly spoken in the preceding verses.

3d. You say, in answer to a remark of mine, that Jesus did not "acknowledge his inability to inform his disciples" of the precise day and hour of his coming. You quote McKnight, and call him my *favorite*. The object of so doing is obvious. But allow me to say, that the author you mention is *your own* favorite, and not *mine*. I believe I have not once quoted him in this controversy—I have quoted Dr. Campbell *against* him. But this is a matter of small importance. Campbell, Wakefield, Newcome, Clarke, and a host of others, stand opposed to McKnight on the passage in question. I believe the received version gives a correct rendering of the original. The entire context discountenances any other rendering. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." The parallel in Mark xiii, 32, is still more emphatic. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." It would have been foolishness to have said, *no man, maketh known that day*, for no man knew when it was to be—and how could any one make known to others what he did not know himself?

4th. You say, "I DO NOT ADMIT that Matt. xxiv, 36—41 and Luke xvii, 20—37 are parallel passages." You are aware that *to admit the parallel would be to destroy your whole argument drawn from* Matt. xxiv, and xxv. You admit the similarity of language, and the only reason you assign for denying the parallelism, is, that in the one case Jesus was addressing *his disciples*, and in the other *the Pharisees*! I cannot think you are satisfied with this reason.—But allowing that you are, I must inform you that *Jesus was addressing his disciples in both cases*. See Luke xvii, 22. "And he said *unto his disciples*, The days will come," &c. The consequence is, that your argument is lost.

5th. You say, "many have been led to conclude that Christ's prophecy concerning his coming must have a *double* meaning and a two-fold accomplishment." But will *you*, sir, pretend that such a conclusion is correct? Will you risk your reputation as a Biblical expositor, by contending for said *double meaning?* In another part of your letter you pronounce certain principles of interpretation erroneous, because, in your judgment, they would "render the Bible an *uncertain, unmeaning* Rule of faith." Are you sure that this would not be consequent of admitting a double meaning in Christ's prophecy concerning his coming?

I may add, while on this point, that Whitby, Pearce, Hammond, Kenrick, Clarke, and others, acknowledge the parallel which you deny. I might furnish many interesting extracts from their notes, but must be content with the following from Whitby, on Matt. xxiv, 40, 41: "That it relates not to the final judgment, but to the time of the destruction of the Jews by the Roman army, is evident from the same words recorded in Luke xvii, 35, 36."

As your *entire argument* drawn from Matt. xxiv, and xxv, rests on the supposition that verse 36 of chap. xxiv, commences the reference to events which are yet future, I desire your particular attention to the proof of that supposition.

Your quotation of Heb. ix, 27, 28, will be of no service to your argument, unless you can show, 1st. That natural death is signified in the expression, "And as it is appointed unto (*tois anthropois*) THE MEN once to *die*, (see preceding verses, and Heb. vii, 28;) and 2d. That the second appearance of Christ, spoken of in verse 28, refers to any other than the present world.

I agree with you that it would be "needless and trifling to attempt to show that everlasting life means everlasting life." Everlasting life is simply the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, John xvii, 3. The believer enjoys it in the present life, as you admit. But I desire you to prove, if you can, that the blessedness of the immortal state depends, in any sense, on the faith of the believer. Neither the belief nor unbelief of man can affect the promise and purpose of God. Paul testifies that "every knee shall bow, and every *tongue* confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father;" and this great consummation of the reign of Jesus cannot be thwarted by the present unbelief of any part of mankind.

You deny that *akatahutos*, endless, is a stronger term than *aionios*, everlasting—and you affirm that the latter is stronger than the former, because "Jesus is said to be made a priest after the power of an *endless life*, *zoes akatalutos*, for this reason, that God had testified, thou art a priest *forever, eis ton aiona*." A few remarks will show the fallacy of your reasoning. 1st. The priesthood of Aaron was *aionion*, everlasting—but you will not pretend that it was *endless*, indissoluble. 2d. The priesthood under the law was "*after the order of Aaron*," but God testified of Christ, "Thou art a priest for ever, *after the order of Melchisedec*." 3d. The *Aaronic* was a *changeable* priesthood, inasmuch as the priests "were not suffered to continue by reason of death;" but Christ, "because he continueth *ever, eis ton aiona*, hath an unchangeable priesthood," that is, there is no succession in the priesthood, for the Son, as High Priest, "is consecrated *forevermore*," *eis ton aiona*. 4th. The *priesthood of Christ is not endless*—for he was made a priest forever "AFTER (*or according to*) *the* POWER *of an endless life*;" but it does not follow that his life, *as a priest*, is endless. Moreover, Paul certifies that the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and be himself subject, that *God may be all in all*. 1 Cor. xv, 28. His mediatorial kingdom *will close*, when all things are subdued unto him and reconciled to God. So the very argument you bring to prove that *aionios* expresses endless duration disproves the position.

Here let it be understood that the adjective in question derives its force primarily from the noun *aion*, to which it is relative; and secondarily, from the nature of the thing to which it is applied. Now, as I showed in a previous letter, *aion* cannot signify *eternity*—for we read of the *beginning* and *end* of *aion*, of *aions* plural, and of the *ends* of *aion*.—Consequently, the *adjective* does not, and cannot, in itself, express an endless duration. Why have you failed to notice my reasoning on this important point? I really attach some consequence thereto, and hope you will honor it with special attention.

In asking you to adduce your proofs of endless punishment, I did not think of making an unreasonable demand.—I did not expect you to find "incongruous affinities and violations of propriety in the sacred oracles." And the two facts, 1st. That there would be incongruity in the phrases *incorruptible torment, indissoluble death*, &c.; and 2d. That no such phrases are found in the sacred oracles—these two facts, I say, furnish strong proof to my mind, that the doctrine of endless punishment is not taught in the Bible.—There would be no violation of good taste in saying, "indissoluble life of misery" "incorruptible existence in torment"—but you will not pretend that either *aphtharto*, or *amaranton*, or *akatalutos*, is, *in any manner or form*, found in the Bible in connexion with *misery*. The immortal existence is one of purity and happiness; not of impurity and wretchedness—for "*in the resurrection* they are *equal unto the angels*, and are the children of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." This testimony of Jesus answers to Rom. viii, 21—"The creation itself also *shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption* into the glorious liberty of *the children of God*."

I desire you to produce a single passage, if you can, in which any word of *equal force* with *aphtharto*, *amaranton*, or *akatalutos*, is applied to punishment, either in the Old Testament or the new. The adjective *aionios* will not answer your purpose—for that this word is *not unequivocal* in its signification, is evident from the fact, that the spirit of inspiration frequently applies it to things which were temporary in their nature and character. For example, the priesthood of Aaron, the law of Moses, the possession of Canaan, &c.

The word *unquenchable*, which you mention, is *also* not to your purpose—for we read in Isa. lxvi, 24, "They shall go forth and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, *neither shall their fire be quenched;* and they shall be an abhorring *unto all flesh*." The phraseology here used confines the whole matter to the present life. It was said of the fire that destroyed Idumea, "*It shall not be quenched*"—yet it *was* quenched thousands of years ago. It was likewise said of the fire to be kindled in the gates of Jerusalem, "*It shall not be quenched*." But it *was* quenched. So you perceive that the word in question is not definite as to the duration it signifies. It is certainly synonymous with *aionion*, in the passages by you cited—but Scripture writers apply both words to things which have long since ceased to be.

Respectfully yours,

ABEL C. THOMAS.

To Correspondents.

"*Lewellyn*," will accept our thanks for his favor. If it was written "with many interruptions," it is the better evidence, as is a common saying, "that there is more from whence that came." We should object to one expression in his present article, *as a term of designation*, or *distinction* among Universalists, and that is, "*Christian* Universalist." Now we *know* no one, *as a Universalist*, except he be a *Christian*. We look upon it, in its purity, only as another name for christianity. May we expect to hear from the writer again?

The original article of Poetry from "S. A. D." is unavoidably crowded by to make room for the Discussion, which it will be perceived is again resumed.

For the same reason we must beg indulgence of Brs. Moore, Parmalee, &c. who will probably be attended to next week.

Married,

In Philadelphia, on Wednesday Evening, July 23, by Evangelist A. C. Thomas, Mr. JOHN SIPPLE, and Miss RHODA OGDEN both of Southwark.

Died,

In Hempstead, L. I. on Monday, 28th ult. EDWARD, infant son of Rev. C. F. LeFevre, of this city, aged 18 months and 16 days. We sympathize with the afflicted parents, for we know something of the trial of parting with deeply cherished offspring.

In Philadelphia on Tuesday morning, July 26, in the 66th year of his age, RICHARD JUDSON, of England, but late of Utica, N. Y. On the 7th day of September last, Mr. Judson arrived in this city, in order to submit himself to the surgical skill of Dr. Randolph, who is eminent as a *lithotomist*. The operation was performed, and hopes of the recovery of the patient were entertained until within a few weeks of his decease. A *post mortem* examination proved that the principle cause of the dreadful pains suffered by Mr. J. was a large cancer on the bowels. This was the cause of his death.

Mr. Judson was the most patient sufferer I ever knew. Although his pains were of the most excruciating character, he was never heard to murmur. He bore his sufferings patiently. He was entirely resigned to the Divine will, whether for life or death. His patience and resignation are accounted for by the simple fact, that he was, and had long been, *a Universalist*—not only nominally, but really—not in *word* only, but in *faith* and in *deed*.

He has left a widow to mourn the loss of one of the best of husbands—and though she is in a land of strangers, she mourns not as those who have no hope. May the Comforter, even the Spirit of truth, administer to her mind the consolations that the world cannot give—sustain her in all her trials, and at the last crown her with the blessing even life forevermore.

Mr. Judson's tabernacle of the flesh was committed to the earth in the burial ground of the first Universalist Church, in the presence of a respectable number of Universalists and others. A. C. T.

In New-Rochelle N. Y. very suddenly, on the 18 ult. JEDUTHEN CADWELL, Esq. aged 61. Mr. Cadwell, we understand, was a firm believer in the goodness of God to a sinful world; and has left a wife and numerous family to mourn over their sudden bereavement. He was a native we believe, of Massachusetts. Will the Trumpet notice his death, for the information of his friends in that section.

FIELD FLOWERS.

(Selected for the Messenger by our Correspondent S. A. D.)

Flower's of the field, how much ye seem
Man's frailty to portray,
Blooming so fair in morning's beam,
Passing at eve away;
Teach this, and oh! though brief your reign,
Sweet flowers ye shall not live in vain.

Go, form a monitory wreathe,
For Youth's unthinking brow;
Go, and to busy manhood breathe
What most he fears to know,
Go strew the path where Age doth tread,
And tell him of the silent dead.

But while to thoughtless ones and gay,
Ye breathe these truths severe,
To those who droop in pale decay
Have ye no word of cheer?
"Oh yes, we weave a double spell,
And death and life betoken well."

Go then, where wrapt in fear and gloom,
Fond hearts and true are sighing,
And deck with emblematic bloom
The pillow of the dying;
And softly speak nor speak in vain,
Of your long sleep and broken chain.

And say that He, who from the dust
Recalls the slumb'ring flower,
Will surely visit those who trust
His mercy and his power;
Will mark where sleeps their peaceful clay,
And roll, ere long, the stone away.

Original.

THE CHRISTIAN'S HOPE.

A Passage in the life of a Sexagenarian.

I was on a visit to my friend Dr. Y——. It was a beautiful autumnal evening. The moon had just emerged from beneath the snowy veil that had for a few moments obscured its brightness, and was sailing in cloudless majesty amid the countless glittering gems that besprinkled the vast ampitheatre on which I was gazing, mantling in its soft light tree and hill, and converting each little streamlet that intersected the fertile vale below into a vein of molten silver, when I was somewhat roughly awakened from the reverie into which I had unconsciously fallen, by a hearty slap on the shoulder. "Come, L——, are you for a walk;" said the Doctor, who was already equipped with hat and cane, ready to sally forth; "come, this is a night to tempt the Infidel to renounce his faith, if faith it may be called, that has not even a shadow for its base—that points the weary way-worn pilgrim of earth, after all the sorrows, cares and toils incident to this transitory life, to a dread vacuum, and darksome void, there to sink into the silent nonentity from which he sprang."

I felt the rebuke; for I was in truth rather sceptical; yea, I was a sceptic—a miserable though an unwilling sceptic; but knowing it was unintentional, as I had never obtruded my sentiments on my friend, I forebore remark, and putting my arm within his we were soon threading a solitary path, where no sound was heard save the rustling of the sear leaves of autumn, as they bent beneath our feet. "I have lost a sweet little patient," my friend began, as we pursued our lonely way, "the only son of his widowed mother; the last of a train of smiling babes that sank one by one into the silent tomb, cut off in early childhood by a wasting disease inherited from their father, who, also, in the prime of life, fell beneath the withering breath of the destroyer, leaving one only little bud of promise to console his adored partner, and win her by his infantile caresses back to life and happiness. And well did he perform his part; he was indeed a consolation such as a widowed mother alone can appreciate. A chubby fair-faced boy; he went not like the rest, slowly yet almost invisibly declining day by day; but having passed strong and healthy his tenth birth-day, longer than any of her little flock had been spared, the fond mother looked upon her darling boy as one sent of God to be the stay and staff of her declining years. Alas! how delusive are our earthly hopes! The angel of Death had even then winged the fatal arrow, and surely, too surely, was it sped! He fell, as it were, in a moment, the victim of an inflammatory disease; and who, oh, who! may essay to administer consolation to the desolate mourner? But we will visit the house of mourning. We can at least mingle our tears with those of the bereaved one. Bereaved, ah! bereaved indeed!" he exclaimed. "Oh, God! 'tis not in frail man to do thy work. To thee, and thee alone, must she look for strength under this sore trial."

The humane physician could restrain himself no longer. He burst into tears and we proceeded in silence to the abode of the afflicted. We entered unperceived, and stole without ceremony into the little parlor, where lay the remains of the beautiful boy—beautiful even in death! The bright locks gently stirred by the light breeze that played upon them through the closed lattice still clustered round his polished forehead. The thin, pale lips seemed just parting to form themselves into a sweet smile, and the crimson tide had scarce as yet receded from his cheek. The mother too was there—alone in her grief—bending over her little one, to imprint a last kiss upon his icy brow—to gaze for the last time upon those beloved features, now so calm and still, which beaming with all the life and animation of sprightly childhood, had so often called forth the fond maternal glance, the glad, approving smile; but he was gone—he in whom all her earthly affections had centered, all her earthly hopes been garnered up; her hearth was desolate; her home a waste place!

I had often, when called to sympathize with those I loved, over dear departed ones, wished, but wished in vain, that it were permitted me to remove but one drop from the cup of their affliction, but never, never before had I so deeply felt the worthlessness—the utter insufficiency of the principles I had imbibed to afford consolation to the afflicted. My heart bled for the sufferer; but what were reason and philosophy to the disconsolate mourner? I felt humbled in her presence; humbled that I had no word of comfort, no balm for the stricken heart to offer.—Not so with my friend. He approached with confidence the widow and the childless, and as she wrung in tearless agony his extended hand, words more precious than the gold of Ophir fell from his lips. He spoke of a once crucified but now risen Redeemer; he dwelt on the hopes, the promises of his gospel. The Christians held sweet communion together, and the bereaved was comforted. The fountain of her tears was opened, and the pearly drops ran in quick succession down her pallid cheeks, as she exclaimed—"I know it, Doctor, I know it! I know that my Redeemer liveth, and oh! what a balm to my soul is the thought that I shall meet my loved ones in that bright, that "better land" to which we are all hastening, where parting words are never known and parting tears are never shed! Oh! 'tis that, and that alone, supports me in this trying hour!" He took her hand and gently led her from the room, and after a brief consultation respecting the necessary arrangements for the funeral, we took our leave.

We met once again—it was at the grave of the fair boy, and when I saw the meek, uncomplaining spirit with which, in the midst of her sorrow, the mother saw the child of her hopes—the darling of her bosom consigned to the cold earth, and the clods of the valley thrown over him, I said to myself, in spite of the doubts engendered by Partialism and nursed by sceptical companions, which had poisoned the stream of my existence, and hung like an incubus upon my soul, from my very boyhood—I said, and said it with a chastened spirit, "Lord I believe, help thou mine unbelief," for surely there must be a blest reality in a faith like this; and never, oh never! will I be instrumental in removing the prop that can so effectually sustain the hapless sojourner in this vale of tears until he is called to wing his way to a happier, more congenial clime.

Many and eventful have been the ever shifting scenes through which I have passed since the incidents transpired, related above. The frosts of twenty winters have silvered o'er my head. The limbs then strong and vigorous, are now palsied by age; but the salutary impressions which they left on my mind have never been effaced, and long, very long, have the gloomy, heart-chilling dogmas of the Infidel given place in my bosom to the life-giving faith—the soul-exhilarating hopes of the *Christian Universalist*.

LEWELLYN.

Universalist Books,

Which way be obtained of A. C. Thomas, 132 Chesnut-street Philadelphia.

Balfour's First Inquiry—being a faithful examination of all the passages in the Bible in which the word Hell occurs —$1.

Balfour's Second Inquiry—being an examination of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the devil, and the import of the words translated everlasting, eternal, forever, &c.—$1.

Balfour's Essays on the state of the dead, and inquiries into the meaning of the words judge, damn, condemn, and their derivatives—$1.

Balfour's Examination of Stuart's Exegetical Essays—75cts.

Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart—25 cts. In this work the author has shown that his conversion to Universalism is mainly attributable to the Professor's criticisms on portions of the Bible.

Balfour's Letter in Reply to Dr. Allen's Lecture against Universal Salvation—25 cts.

Balfour's Letter to Whitman in defence of so much of the First Inquiry as pertains to the term Gehenna—25 cts.

Ballou's Treatise on Atonement—an invaluable work, being an inquiry into the origin, nature and effects of sin, and of the consequences of the Atonement—50 cts.

Ballou's Notes in illustration of the Parables—75 cts.

Ballou's XXVI Lectures on important doctrines—$1.

Ballou's XXV Select Sermons on various subjects—$1.

Ballou's XI Sermons delivered in Philadelphia—37 cts.

Ballou's Examination of the doctrine of future Punishishment—50 cts.

Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d.—$1.

Modern History of Universalism, by T. Whittemore—$1.

T. Southwood Smith's Treatise on the Divine Government —a work I would not be without for five times the price —75 cts.

Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, by Thomas Whittemore—an admirable and very useful volume—75 cts.

Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators, showing that the most eminent Partialist critics justify the Universalist's interpretations of nearly every prominent passage in the New Testament—$1.

Life of John Murray—Whittemore's much improved edition, 50 cts.—do. Marsh, Capen and Lyon's, 46 cts—also an edition at 37 cts.

Winchester's Dialogues on Universal Restoration—63 cts.

R. Streeter's Familiar Conversations on the doctrine and tendency of Universalism—a fine work—50 cts.

Streeter's News from Three Worlds—25 cts.

Universalist Expositor—critical and explanatory—3 volumes $2, 50 each.

Dolphus Skinner's Letters to Drs. Aikin and Lansing—50 cts.

Eternal Hell Torments Overthrown—37 cts.

Pitt Morse's Review of Parker's Lectures against the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

David Pickering's Lectures in proof of Divine Revelation —a subject to which Christians do not sufficiently attend —75 cts.

Letters on Revelation between Ballou and Kneeland—50 cts.

Streeter's New Universalist Hymn Book—50 cts.

Das Neue Allgemeine Gesang-Buchlein, zum gebrauch aller aufrichtigen Christen—von G. Grosch und J. Myers —25 cts. I wish our German friends would buy this book.

Discussion at Danvers between Whittemore and Braman —25 cts.

Christian Visitant—a very useful and interesting work, in two volumes—25 cts. each.

Reply to Hawes' Reasons for not embracing Universalism—13 cts.

Christian Messenger, vols. I and II bound—$4 for the set.

Universalist, vol. I bound—$1, 25.

ALSO,

Sermons, Pamphlets, &c. on a variety of subjects—many of them in cheap form for gratuitous distribution.

"Come and See."

Rayner's Lectures.

Just received and for sale at this office, Rayner's Lectures, comprising nine lectures on the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, (noticed a few weeks since in the Messenger,) price 50 cents.